

Language Learning and Acculturation: Lessons From High School and Gap-Year Exchange Students

Allison J. Spenader

College of St. Benedict and St. John's University

Abstract: *This study investigates the relationship between acculturation and language learning during a year-long study abroad program at the pre-collegiate level. The researcher presents the experiences of four U.S. American sojourners to Sweden as case studies. This mixed-methods study looks specifically at students with no prior knowledge of the target language. The researcher compared descriptions of students' acculturation and a measure of their acculturative outcomes to their language development as measured by an unofficial Oral Proficiency Interview after 5 and 10 months. The results indicated that higher levels of acculturation are associated with higher levels of proficiency, while a rejection of the host culture is associated with lower levels of proficiency. The researcher presents the implications for study abroad program designs that support language learning.*

Key words: *Swedish, acculturation, high school, homestay, oral proficiency, study abroad*

Introduction

When it comes to language learning, one often assumes that studying abroad will result in the development of superior language skills. One may often view a semester or year abroad as the capstone experience in one's career as a foreign language learner. Yet great variation in language acquisition exists among participants in study abroad programs. Schumann (1986) and Ward (Ward, 1996; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001) suggest that language learning may be directly or indirectly influenced by acculturative outcomes. How and to what extent an exchange student acculturates seems to be influenced by many variables, including how the program is structured (host community, family, and school), as well as the individual's personality.

To date, much research has focused on college-level programs and the ways in which they build on previous language study to enhance language learning. Yet relatively little attention has been paid to high school and gap-year program parti-

Allison J. Spenader (PhD, University of Minnesota) is Assistant Professor of Education at the College of St. Benedict and St. John's University, St. Joseph, Minnesota.

participants,¹ and language educators know very little about the experiences of sojourners with no previous exposure to the target language prior to study abroad. This study asks the following questions: (1) What language gains are made by beginners who participate in a high school or gap-year program abroad? and (2) Which acculturative outcome(s) support(s) higher levels of language learning? Furthermore, this study aims to inform our understanding of the roles of program design (such as the families and communities where students are placed and student participation in mainstream classrooms) as well as how the individual personality variables such as assertiveness and sense of humor impact acculturation and language learning.

Review of Literature

Extended and continuous contact with host nationals² puts exchange students in a position to experience changes in behavior, values, emotions, and language. The term *acculturation* refers to “the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language group” (Schumann, 1986, p. 379).³ According to Schumann, “the learner will acquire the second language only to the degree that he acculturates” (1986, p. 379). Schumann’s model was created to describe the immigrant experience, but the factors he identified are appealing to researchers of study abroad experiences as well.

In his model, Berry (1997) identified four outcomes that result from cross-cultural contact that describe the extent to which an individual might experience acculturation. First, assimilation occurs when an individual gives up his or her own cultural identity to wholly adopt a new culture. Separation refers to the opposite situation, in which an individual rejects the new or dominant culture and avoids contact with host nationals. Integration refers to a situation in which an individual maintains the first culture while seeking to participate in the social networks of the new culture. Finally, when an individual rejects both the

new and the first culture, minimization occurs.

Pre-collegiate exchange students are generally afforded increased opportunity to interact with native speakers of the target language because they reside in a homestay environment and participate in a mainstream high school classroom. As a result, the high school or gap-year student is “submersed” in the target language community in a way that the college-level sojourner often is not (Marriott, 1995). Some programmatic elements seem to support more meaningful, plentiful, and supportive interactions with host nationals, such as the homestay environment (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004). Language educators should examine this contact to inform our understanding of how these interpersonal relationships are supported by program environments and what role they play in the individual language learning experience.

As Lapkin, Hart, and Swain (1995) pointed out, living with host families and attending public school provide students with one-to-one contact, resulting in a more intense cross-cultural experience. In a study of pre-collegiate exchange students, Ward and Kennedy (1993) found that language learning was related to increased time spent with host nationals and less time spent with co-nationals. In another study, students who had language as a specific personal goal of their study abroad experience viewed the host family “as an integral part in achieving that goal” (Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004, p. 261).

However, living with a host family does not guarantee a successful language learning environment. In a study looking at exchange students going to Russia, Rivers (1998) found that students residing in homestay environments underperformed their peers who lived in dorms in terms of speaking gains. Rivers noted the importance of matching sojourners with compatible hosts who “will take an active interest in the participant, providing more interaction with the participant” (1998, p. 497). Clearly the positive effect of homestay

environments relies on a good match between hosts and their students.

Freed explained, "It has long been assumed that this combination of immersion in the native speech community, integrated with formal classroom learning, creates the best environment for learning a second language" (1995a, p. 5). Paige noted that "the less language ability the sojourner possesses, the greater will be the psychological intensity of the experience," and that "lack of language skills can lead to social isolation or frustration" (1993, p. 7). For the pre-collegiate exchange student, formal language instruction is not always guaranteed. Many exchange students are placed in countries where less commonly taught languages are spoken and less of a tradition of teaching those languages as a foreign language exist. Formal instruction is often offered but not necessarily required for many exchange students.

Many studies have looked at the real linguistic benefits of study abroad programs. Students who study abroad make gains in oral proficiency that are more profound than the gains made by students who do not go abroad (Carroll, 1967; Clement, 1978; Gardner, Glickman, & Smyth, 1978; Magnan, 1986; Ryan & Lafford, 1992). For example, in a study comparing study abroad students in Mexico and Spain to a control group back in the United States, Lafford (1995) found that students who studied abroad outperformed their peers at home in terms of communicative strategies usage and were generally better able to converse using appropriate language structures. Similarly, study abroad participants appeared to outperform their at-home peers in terms of fluency development (Freed, 1995b). In particular, rate of speech and the length of fluent speech runs were found to be associated with fluent-sounding speech in study abroad participants. Finally, Freed questioned whether students without prior exposure to the target language should be encouraged to study abroad (1995a, p. 17). It is important to look at absolute beginner language learners in study abroad programs because they repre-

sent a large group of exchange students who travel to countries where less commonly taught languages are spoken.

Personality factors are also believed to influence cross-cultural adaptation and language learning. Schumann (1986) noted that an extroverted personality can benefit from acculturation. Similarly, one would expect traits such as persistence and assertiveness to promote successful cross-cultural adaptation. This study also looked at the sojourner's sense of humor as a personality trait that might be influential.

Method

It would be impossible, and even impractical, to investigate naturalistic language learning without taking into account the rich social environment in which it happens. This study uses a case study approach, which allows for a view of language learning and cross-cultural adaptation as a socially mediated process. This study employs the ethnographic methods of observation, interviews, and field notations to understand and describe the personal experiences of the sojourners. Measures of language learning and acculturation further illuminate the individual development of each exchange student.

Participants

The researcher selected four U.S. pre-collegiate students studying abroad in Sweden for an academic year for this study. The students were all participants in a well-established study abroad program henceforth referred to as Exchange Program, or EP. The EP office in Stockholm was instrumental in identifying possible participants for the study, recommending both male and female students, gap-year and high school students, and a mix of urban, suburban, and rural host communities. EP also provided some basic personality descriptions, including student interests, along with recommendations for inclusion in the study (see Table 1). Despite variation in the size of host communities, the schools attended by all participants were similar in size, and all

TABLE 1

Overview of Participants

Participant *	Age at Arrival	Status	Student Characteristics	Host Community
Faith	18	Gap-year	Friendly, hockey player	Medium-sized town
Elsa	18	Gap-year	Thoughtful, social	Urban
Jenny	16	High school	Outgoing, soccer player	Medium-sized town
Max	17	Gap-year	Thoughtful, quiet, musical	Rural

*Pseudonyms

students were placed in mainstream classrooms. Similarly, all students participated to some extent in a pull-out model Swedish for Immigrants class, called SFI. All students were placed in two-parent host families with children living at home.

Due to delays in obtaining Institutional Review Board approval, the study began in January 2004. However, the students arrived in Sweden in late August and had been in Sweden for about 5 months prior to the first round of data collection. The researcher identified students for inclusion in the study in early September, following a week-long in-country orientation organized by EP. The researcher did not deem previous data regarding the students' oral proficiency levels necessary, as none of the students had studied Swedish prior to arrival.⁴

Data Sources

The researcher gathered both qualitative and quantitative data for this study during the course of 5 months. Data collection took place during January and May in Sweden, and via e-mail between February and April.

Qualitative data included:

1. *Observations of students.* The researcher "shadowed" students during a typical day at school and after school. Each shadow resulted in 8–12 hours of con-

tinuous observation. Observations took place in January and in May.

2. *Interviews with students, teachers, and host parents.* On the day of the observation, the researcher conducted interviews to hear about the students' experiences from multiple perspectives (see Appendix A).
3. *Monthly e-mail questionnaires.* Each participant e-mailed answers to questions provided by the researcher in February, March, and April (see Appendix B).

Quantitative data included oral proficiency interviews (OPIs) and the Acculturation Index (AI). The researcher conducted unofficial OPIs with each participant as a measure of their proficiency level in January and again in May. This interview format was originally developed by the Foreign Services Institute (FSI) and later revised by the Interagency Languages Roundtable (ILR).⁵ The researcher chose to score the OPIs using the FSI-ILR scales for Swedish because those scales provided a wide range of Swedish-specific descriptors.

The researcher, who is familiar with ACTFL OPI protocols, although not a certified interviewer or tester, recorded and transcribed the OPIs prior to rating.⁶ The interviews followed the following format: a warm-up, a level check, several probes, and then two role-play situations. The interviews ended with some general

also commented on his lack of assertiveness and shed light on the day-to-day reality of Max's year in Sweden.

He's a little bit mistreated. And coupled with the fact that he's not exactly the type who takes initiative, no. And I think that the teachers sometimes forget to support him, to give him some extra help. But with me, he doesn't try to speak Swedish with me; he starts out in English directly.

Max had been placed in both a mainstream classroom and an SFI class. When I visited with the teacher again in May, he was very surprised to hear that Max had not attended any classes since March. The mainstream teacher assumed he was in SFI, while the SFI teacher had assumed he was in the mainstream classroom. This avoidance of class reflects a level of disenfranchisement from the school setting. However, Max also expressed that his strongest support system came from fellow cultural "outsiders," namely, immigrants.

Max's final e-mail correspondence in April included many negative comments concerning Swedes in general as well as Swedes he knew personally. Max distanced himself from Swedes by aligning himself with the immigrants in his school, in the following comments taken from his May interview.

Oh, if there was another fight like that, and I was nearby, I would fight on the side of the immigrants. I just feel more connected to the immigrants. I guess since most of my friends are immigrants.

Max retained, and perhaps even strengthened, his American identity during his EP year. For Max, there were very few meaningful relationships with Swedes. Besides his host mother and his teacher, Max did not appear to have any Swedish friends. In many respects Max's environment created challenges that proved insurmountable. Being hosted in a rural community in a challenging homestay environment created a situation in which

rewarding contact with host nationals was difficult to attain. Max did not receive the kinds of programmatic and social supports he needed to integrate or assimilate, and instead he experienced significant stress associated with his acculturative outcome: separation.

Summary

The findings of this study support the notion that language learning is indeed influenced by acculturation and, more specifically, relationships with host nationals. The first research question asked what linguistic gains were made by exchange students without previous target language ability. This study shows that absolute beginners can make gains comparable to and even surpassing those made by sojourners with a formal background in the target language, as shown in previous studies (Freed 1995a). All four students reached ACTFL level Intermediate-High or higher after only 5 months in Sweden, and three reached the level of Superior by the 10th month. Interestingly, the study did not find formal instruction in Swedish to be the only predictor of language gains. While SFI seems to have benefited some participants in the study, Faith, who ultimately reached the highest level of proficiency, noted that the mainstream classroom offered a richer linguistic environment. This suggests that some absolute beginners participating in high school and gap-year programs can reach high levels of oral proficiency even without ongoing formal instruction; this highlights a need for educators to take a closer look at how formal language instruction can support sojourners. Rather than formal instruction, a supportive host environment and meaningful relationships with host nationals appear to be the most influential elements of the study abroad experience in terms of language learning.

The second research question asked which acculturative outcomes were associated with higher levels of language learning. The acculturative outcome of assimilation

appears to be most strongly associated with high levels of oral proficiency. The more Faith assumed a Swedish identity, the more her Swedish improved. And as her Swedish improved, her identity shifted even further. An integrative outcome was also associated with good language learning, and overall well-being, as illustrated by Jenny's experience. Elsa's mixed outcomes of assimilation and separation appear to also support language learning and may reflect a balance between two cultural identities rather than an integration of the two.

In contrast, the outcome of separation on its own appears to be associated with distress and a rejection of the new language and culture. Max's experience provides a powerful illustration of separation. The statement he made about fighting on the side of the immigrants against the Swedes offers a striking example of just how disenfranchised he felt. He also stated that he did not see any reason to speak Swedish, as he did not think it would help him communicate with Swedes. His acculturative outcome and language ratings support the notion that separation from host nationals is related to less successful language learning.

The personality factor of assertiveness emerged as particularly important for successful cross-cultural adaptation and language learning. All four participants noted that opportunities to use Swedish did not always come naturally but required effort on their part. The data suggest that the more assertive students are about using the target language, the higher their level of ultimate language proficiency will be. The other personality factor studied, sense of humor, appeared to assist both Faith and Elsa in risk-taking behaviors related to language. These two students also made the greatest language gains, suggesting that humor may have a positive influence on language learning.

Programmatic variables such as the ability to remain in a mainstream classroom and access to public transportation also appear to play an important role in affording sojourners opportunities to form

relationships with their hosts. Clearly, Max's host environment was not a good match for his personality or emotional needs. Exchange programs should attend carefully to placing students in supportive environments and should strive to match students with families and communities that engage sojourners academically, socially, and emotionally.

Implications for Future Research

While this study was limited in terms of the number of individuals studied, it provides a detailed description of the lived experiences of adolescent sojourners. More research is needed to further educators' understanding of what advantages exist to studying abroad prior to college, both socially and psychologically. The findings of this study support the promotion of study abroad opportunities for pre-collegiate sojourners as well as for learners without previous language study. More studies on greater numbers of absolute beginners in study abroad are needed to further investigate how these programs facilitate language learning and what role formal instruction plays in that process.

The study points out the importance of supportive host environments in study abroad. The data also show how a poor match between student and host community can severely impede cross-cultural adaptation and language learning. Additional research on this subset of study abroad can aid an understanding of the roles of the host family and of teachers and peers in mainstream classrooms and can help study abroad program designers improve their programs to support student language learning and well-being. Finally, the roles of humor and assertiveness appear to warrant further study as pertinent personality variables. Individual sojourner experiences are certainly complex, yet through further study of both programmatic and individual variables, a clearer picture of ways in which educators can optimize language learning abroad will emerge.

6. Had you ever traveled or lived abroad before your EP experience? If so, where and when?
7. Are you a Swedish American? Scandinavian American?
8. Why did you become an EP exchange student?
9. Did you choose Sweden? Why or why not?
10. How did you feel about Sweden before you came here with EP?
11. What were your goals for your year in Sweden? To learn a new language? Adventure? Get away from your parents?

Questions about the Host Family

1. Tell me about your Swedish host family.
2. What sorts of activities do you do together?
3. Do you enjoy spending time with your host family?
4. What members of your host family do you feel closest to? Why?
5. Does your host family help you learn Swedish?
6. What things does your host family do that you find somewhat strange?
7. What things does your host family do that you really enjoy?
8. Can you tell me about a situation in which you had a cultural misunderstanding with your family?
9. Can you tell me about a situation in which you had to adapt to a new behavior to fit in with your host family?
10. Do you think that your family is a “typical” Swedish family? Why or why not?
11. How much of what is going on around you at home do you understand?
12. Do you feel like a member of your host family? In what way?

Questions about School

1. Tell me about your *gymnasium*.
2. Tell me about your class.
3. Tell me about your first day of school.
4. Do you enjoy attending classes? Why or why not?
5. Have you been successful at making friends at school? Tell me about the process of making friends at school.
6. Do you tend to speak mostly Swedish or mostly English with your friends? Why?
7. Are you getting grades in your courses? Why or why not?
8. What classes do you enjoy most? Why?
9. What teachers do you enjoy most? Why?
10. Are you involved in any extracurricular activities? Tell me about that.
11. Can you tell me about a situation at school in which you had a cultural misunderstanding?
12. Can you tell me about a situation in which you had to adapt to a new behavior to fit in with your classmates?
13. What would you say are the biggest differences between Swedish *gymnasium* and American high school?
14. How much of what is going on around you in school do you understand?
15. Do you feel like a member of your class? Why or why not?

General Questions

1. All in all, how do you feel your year is going in Sweden?
2. How “Swedish” do you feel at this point?
3. How “American” do you feel at this point?

4. What are you most frustrated with? Why?
5. What do you enjoy most about living in Sweden?

Student Interview 2 (May)—Additional Questions

1. Are you still living with the same host family? If not, tell me why you switched families, and tell me about your new family. (host family question)
2. Are you attending the same *gymnasium* as before? If not, tell me about your new *gymnasium*, and your class. (school question)
3. Do you tend to speak mostly Swedish or mostly English with your friends? Why? (school question)

Host Parent Interview 1 (January)

1. How do you think things are going for your EP student?
2. Can you tell me about how it went when _____ first came to live with you?
3. What have you done as a family in order to help your student adjust to Swedish culture?
4. How much Swedish do you speak with your student? How much English?
5. What do you think has been the most difficult for your student?
6. Can you tell me about a situation in which your student misunderstood something about Swedish culture? What happened?
7. How much Swedish does your EPer know? Do you think they are really trying to learn Swedish? Why or why not?
8. How much time does your EPer spend with Swedes? With other exchange students? With Americans?
9. Has your student been able to adapt to Swedish culture? Why or why not?
10. Do you think your EPer seems “Swedish”? Why or why not?

Host Parent Interview 2 (May)—Additional Question

How do you think things are going for your EP student now?

Teacher Interview Guide (used in January and May)

1. How do you think things are going for the EP student in school?
2. Can you tell me about how it went when _____ first came to your class?
3. What have you done as a class in order to help your student adjust to Swedish culture?
4. How much Swedish do you speak with the student? How much English?
5. What do you think has been the most difficult for the student?
6. Can you tell me about a situation in which your student misunderstood something about Swedish culture? What happened?
7. How much Swedish does the EPer know? Do you think they are really trying to learn Swedish? Why or why not?
8. How much time does the EPer spend with Swedes? With other exchange students? With Americans?
9. Has the student been able to adapt to Swedish culture? Why or why not?
10. Did the student get grades in their classes last term? (Do you think they will get grades next term? [Question asked in January only]) Why or why not?
11. Do you think the EPer seems “Swedish”? Why or why not?

